Claims 1, 4-6, 8-10, 15-17, 22, and 23 are presently pending and stand rejected. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4-6, 8, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Claim 1 is amended to tie the method claim to a structure, specifically a decoder. Accordingly, Assignee respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw the rejection to claims 1, 4-6, 8, and 9 under § 101.

Claims 6 and 10 were objected to. Assignee has amended claims 6 and 10 as suggested by Examiner and requests that the objections be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 4-6, 8, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Veltman in view of Nagai.

Claim 1 is amended to recite among other limitations, "receiving at a decoder, a first portion of an encoded two-dimensional block of pixel data immediately followed by a second encoded two-dimensional block of pixel data, the second block followed by another portion of the encoded two-dimensional block of pixel data".

Assignee respectfully submits that neither Veltman or Nagai teach the foregoing. Examiner has indicated that Veltman teaches "that both the first portion, i.e., video input data, and the second portion, i.e., video time stamp, are parts of one encoded symbol or code string of encoded video bitstream received by demultiplexer 44, wherein the first portion of video data comprises pixel data and the second portion comprises pixilated data received in a sequential manner as the received video data is inputted. Thus, Veltman discloses the second portion comprises a second block of pixel data followed by another portion of

the first block of pixel data.

Assignee respectfully submits that the Veltman does not teach the newly added limitation. Examiner has read the second portion on "video time stamp". However, Assignee respectfully submits that even the broadest reasonable interpretation of "second encoded two-dimensional block of pixel data" can read on "video time stamp".

Moreover, Assignee also submits that even if Veltman discloses "video input data" and "video time stamp" are parts of one encoded code string, the foregoing does not teach "a first portion of an encoded two-dimensional block of pixel data immediately followed by a second encoded two-dimensional block of pixel data, the second block *followed by another portion of the encoded two-dimensional block of pixel data*". Note that "the encoded two-dimensional block of pixel data" claims antecedent basis to "an encoded two-dimensional block of pixel data" from "a first portion of an encoded two-dimensional block of pixel data".

Regarding claim 10, claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Veltman, Nagain, and Shinohara. Examiner has indicated that Veltman and Nagai do not disclose "an end of block indicator", however, Shinohara teaches the use of the end of block indicator at col. 17, lines 37-40, fig. 7, elements 127 and 128. However, Shinohara teaches that "An EOB appending circuit 127 *appends EOB* (end-of-block) codes to the low-speed special playback data. Another EOB appending circuit 128 *appends EOB codes* to the high-speed special playback data." Assignee respectfully submits that Shinohara does not teach the now claimed "a first memory buffer for storing either portions of the encoded video data stream of predetermined

size or until the portions of the encoded video data stream until the portions include an end of block indicator received at the input; a second memory buffer for storing remainders of portions when the portions include an end of block indicator received at the input". Accordingly, Assignee respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw the rejection to claim 10 and its dependent claims.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Assignee respectfully submits that each of the pending claims are allowable and Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this case to issuance. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge additional fees or credit overpayments to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Account No. 13-0017.

Dated: May 6, 2009   Respectfully submitted,

                                      Mirut Dalal
                                      Reg. No. 44,052
                                      Attorney for Applicants

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison Street
Chicago, Illinois 60661

Telephone: (312) 775-8000
Facsimile: (312) 775-8100